

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 8, 10-23 and 25-27 are now present in the application. Claims 8, 14, 19 and 25-27 have been amended. Claims 8, 14 and 19 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 8, 10-12, 14-17, 19-22 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lopatinsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,659,169. Claims 13, 18 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lopatinsky. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claims 8, 14 and 19 have been amended to recite a combination of elements including "the motor for driving the rotary shaft is mounted below the cover and away from the heat sink." Support for the above amendments to claims 8, 14 and 19 can be found in FIG. 3 of the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claims 8, 14 and 19 is not disclosed nor suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, the Examiner alleged that Lopatinsky in FIGs. 10 and 12 and col. 9, lines 10-20 discloses a motor mounted onto the plate 217 (referred to by the Examiner as the cover). However, Lopatinsky in FIGs. 10 and 12 and col. 9, lines 10-20 simply discloses a disk-type

centrifugal blower 206. Lopatinsky nowhere discloses a motor, not to mention the fact that Lopatinsky nowhere discloses the location of the motor. Therefore, Lopatinsky fails to teach “*the motor for driving the rotary shaft is mounted below the cover and away from the heat sink*” as recited in claims 8, 14 and 19.

In addition, as shown in FIGs. 10 and 12 of Lopatinsky, the disks 207 of the disk-type centrifugal blower 206 are located immediately below the plate 217. Therefore, even if there were a motor in Lopatinsky, assuming *arguendo*, the motor will not be located below the plate 217. Therefore, one skilled in the would not have the motivation to mount the motor below Lopatinsky’s plate 217.

Since Lopatinsky fails to teach each and every limitation of amended independent claims 8, 14 and 19, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 14 and 19 and their dependent claims (at least due to their dependency) clearly define over the teachings of Lopatinsky. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicants also respectfully request to conduct a telephone interview with the Examiner at the earliest convenience of the Examiner. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ representative, Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, at (703) 205-8000 to schedule a telephone interview.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Application No. 09/930,990
Amendment dated August 21, 2008
Reply to Office Action of May 30, 2008

Docket No.: 0941-1282PUS1

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

fu Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant